AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figures 1-2.

Figures 1-2 are now labeled "Background Art".

Attachment:

Replacement sheet

Annotated sheet showing changes

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-7 are pending, with Claims 1-4 and 6 amended by the present Amendment.

In the Official Action, the specification was objected to; Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Song (U.S. Patent No. 6,435,842); and Claims 2 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song in view of Parker (U.S. Patent No. 3,248,044).

Applicant notes that while the Official Action summary indicates that Claim 7 is rejected, no grounds of rejection were listed in the Official Action. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 7 contains allowable subject matter as no grounds of rejection are of record.

The specification is amended in response to the outstanding objection and to cure additional informalities noted by Applicant. Figures 1-2 are labeled "Background Art." Claims 1-4 and 6 are amended to avoid an interpretation under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph, and to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. No new matter is added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the discussion between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on November 26, 2007. During the discussion, Applicant's Figure 3 was compared to Figures 4 and 5a of Song. Applicant's representative pointed out how frame 23 is inserted into frame 22. The Examiner

acknowledged that no comparable insertion of frames or other structures is shown in the figures of Song.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to

A reciprocating compressor, comprising:

a reciprocating motor disposed in a casing, and configured to generate a driving force;

a compression unit configured to suck, compress, and discharge gas by the driving force of the reciprocating motor;

a resonant spring unit configured to provide a reciprocating movement of the reciprocating motor with a resonant movement; and

at least two spring supporting frames configured to support the resonant spring unit, wherein one of the spring supporting frames is inserted into another of the spring supporting frames.

With Applicant's claimed invention, fabrication is simplified.¹

Song describes a reciprocating compressor that includes a reciprocating motor disposed in a casing, and configured to generate a driving force; a compression unit configured to suck, compress, and discharge gas by the driving force of the reciprocating motor; and a resonant spring unit configured to provide a reciprocating movement of the reciprocating motor with a resonant movement.

However, frame 1 and cover 2 of Song do not correspond to Applicant's claimed at least two spring supporting frames configured to support the resonant spring unit, wherein one of the spring supporting frames is *inserted into* another of the spring supporting frames. In a non-limiting example seen in Applicant's Figs. 3-4, spring supporting frames 22 and 23 support the resonant spring unit 50, with frame 23 inserted into frame 22. In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, in Song, cover 2 is not

JTE/MEM/ma

8

¹ Specification, page 4, lines 22-25.

inserted into frame 1 of Song. Instead, cover 2 abuts frame 1 in a manner similar to that shown in Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (see, e.g., abutting frames 122 and 123 shown in Applicant's Figure 1. The abutting of frames shown in Song (and in Applicant's Figure 1) does not include an insertion of one frame into another frame.

Applicant also traverses the rejection of dependent Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, that the second spring supporting frame comprises: a disc shaped second spring supporting portion on which the second spring is supported, and a second cylindrical portion extended from *an outer circumference* of the second spring supporting portion toward the first spring supporting frame, and *inserted at an inner circumferential surface* of the first cylindrical portion of the first spring supporting frame. For the reasons stated above, the abutting of frames shown in Song (and in Applicant's Figure 1) does not include an insertion of one frame into an inner circumferential surface of another frame. Thus, for independent reasons, Applicant submit that Claim 3 is not anticipated by Song.

MPEP § 2131 notes that "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See also MPEP § 2131.02. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Because Song does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in Claims 1 and 3, Song does not anticipate the invention recited in Claims 1 and 3, and all claims depending therefrom.

Applicant has considered Parker and submit that Parker does not cure the deficiencies of Song. As none of the cited art, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests at least the above-noted features of independent Claims 1 and 3, Applicant submits the inventions defined by Claims 1 and 3, and all claims depending therefrom, are not rendered obvious by the asserted references for at least the reasons stated above.²

² MPEP § 2142 "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael E. Monaco Reg. No. 52,041 at the telephone numbe0r of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Hames T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant